

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 ROBERT C. BONJORNI, *et al.*,
9 Plaintiffs,
10 v.
11 WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,
12 Defendant.

Case No. C11-1841RSL

ORDER DENYING
RECONSIDERATION

13 On April 2, 2012, plaintiffs filed a “Motion for Court to Reconsider Order of
14 Dismissal and Motion for Leave to Supplement and Amend Complaint” in the above-captioned
15 matter. Dkt. # 22. Motions for reconsideration must be filed within fourteen days of the date of
16 the Order at issue and, even when timely filed, are disfavored in this district. Local Civil Rule
17 7(h). Plaintiffs offer no explanation for their tardy filing. The motion for reconsideration is
18 therefore denied as untimely.

19 Nor have plaintiffs shown “manifest error in the prior ruling” or “new facts or
20 legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court’s] attention earlier without
21 reasonable diligence.” Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1). Plaintiffs argue that a consent decree to which
22 defendant is a party may be relevant to this case, but make no attempt to explain its relevance, to
23 provide a proposed amended pleading, or to otherwise show that reconsideration and/or
24 amendment would be anything but futile.¹ Plaintiffs’ claims were dismissed for a number of
25

26
¹ Instead, plaintiffs make sweeping statements that convey no actual information, such as providing a summary of mortgage litigation around the country “to present some of the issues that are
ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION

1 reasons, and none of them could be cured by amendment.

2
3 For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration and/or
4 amendment is DENIED.

5 Dated this 4th day of April, 2012.

6
7 

8 Robert S. Lasnik
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

part of the issues that will be part of the recently discovered information we pray the Court will allow in the requested supplemental pleading." Dkt. # 22 at 4.